



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/015,256	12/13/2001	Mary I. Hageman	YOR9-2001-0721-US1	1723

28211 7590 01/13/2005

FREDERICK W. GIBB, III  
MCGINN & GIBB, PLLC  
2568-A RIVA ROAD  
SUITE 304  
ANNAPOLIS, MD 21401

EXAMINER

CHOJNACKI, MELLISSA M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2164

DATE MAILED: 01/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/015,256

Applicant(s)

HAGEMAN ET AL.

Examiner

Mellissa M Chojnacki

Art Unit

2164

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 July 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

  
**SAM RIMELL**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

### Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892).
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Remarks*

1. In response to communications filed on July 28, 2004, claims 1-21 are presently pending in the application.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sziklai et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,341,287).

As to claim 1, Sziklai et al. teaches a method for tracking custom computer application development profiles in a data processing system (See abstract, where “custom computer application” is read on “information on operations and requirements concerning an activity or area of business”; also see column 8, lines 60-65), the method comprising:

Art Unit: 2164

creating the profiles with a first database tool (See column 8, lines 25-41, lines 60-67; column 9, lines 1-3, where “profiles” is read on “business operations”; also see column 9, lines 13-19);

gathering requirements of the profiles with a second database tool (See abstract; column 10, lines 24-33, where “disposal of hazardous waste in landfills” is used as an example of collecting profile data and regulations);

tracking modifications of the profiles with a third database tool (See column 8, lines 65-67; column 9, lines 1-3; column 32, lines 24-34);

allowing security and authorization users access to the profiles (See column 9, lines 13-19; column 14, lines 50-58; column 21, lines 65-67); and

determining whether breaches in security of the data processing system has occurred in each phase of development of a computer application program (See abstract; column 9, lines 10-16; column 14, lines 50-62; column 21, lines 65-67; column 33, lines 5-10; column 34, lines 1-4).

As to claims 2, 9 and 16 Sziklai et al. teaches wherein in the step of tracking modifications of the profiles with a third database tool, the third database tool comprises a Profile Matrix, wherein the Profile Matrix comprises a data set (See column 13, lines 14-22; column 25, lines 56-67; column 26, lines 1-7); wherein the third database tool comprises a Profile Matrix, and wherein the Profile Matrix comprises a data set (See column 13, lines 14-22; column 25, lines 56-67; column 26, lines 1-7); wherein the third database tool comprises a Profile

Art Unit: 2164

Matrix, and wherein the Profile Matrix comprises a data set (See column 13, lines 14-22; column 25, lines 56-67; column 26, lines 1-7).

As to claims 3, 10 and 17 Sziklai et al. teaches wherein in the step of tracking modifications of the profiles with a third database tool, the third database tool allows tracking capability of tasks required to gather and implement changes to the profiles (See abstract; column 7, lines 42-57; column 8, lines 25-41; column 9, lines 58-61); wherein the third database tool allows tracking capability of tasks required to gather and implement changes to the profiles (See abstract; column 7, lines 42-57; column 8, lines 25-41; column 9, lines 58-61); wherein in the method, the step of tracking modifications of the profiles with a third database tool allows tracking capability of tasks required to gather and implement changes to the profiles (See abstract; column 7, lines 42-57; column 8, lines 25-41; column 9, lines 58-61).

As to claims 4, 11 and 18 Sziklai et al. teaches wherein in the step of gathering requirements of the profiles with a second database tool, the second database tool comprises a profile requirement worksheet, wherein the profile requirement worksheet identifies the data (See column 9, lines 32-40, where "worksheet" is read on "worklist"; column 10, lines 47-53); wherein the second database tool comprises a profile requirement worksheet, and wherein the profile requirement worksheet identifies the data (See column 9, lines 32-40, where "worksheet" is read on "worklist"; column 10, lines 47-53); wherein the second

Art Unit: 2164

database tool comprises a profile requirement worksheet, and wherein the profile requirement worksheet identifies the data (See column 9, lines 32-40, where “worksheet” is read on “worklist”; column 10, lines 47-53).

As to claims 5, 12 and 19 Sziklai et al. teaches wherein in the step of gathering requirements of the profiles with a second database tool, the second database tool further identifies authorization objects and field values of the profile requirement worksheet necessary to gather the requirements of the profiles (See column 11, lines 13-22, lines 28-30; column 21, lines 11-15); wherein the second database tool further identifies authorization objects and field values of the profile requirement worksheet necessary to gather the requirements of the profiles (See column 11, lines 13-22, lines 28-30; column 21, lines 11-15); wherein the second database tool further identifies authorization objects and field values of the profile requirement worksheet necessary to gather the requirements of the profiles (See column 11, lines 13-22, lines 28-30; column 21, lines 11-15).

As to claims 6, 13 and 20 Sziklai et al. teaches wherein the step of creating the profiles with a first database tool further comprises editing the profiles (See column 19, lines 30-32; column 21, lines 21-23); wherein the first database tool edits the profiles (See column 19, lines 30-32; column 21, lines 21-23); wherein in the method, the step of creating the profiles with a first database tool further comprises editing the profiles (See column 19, lines 30-32; column 21, lines 21-23).

As to claims 7, 14 and 21 Sziklai et al., teaches wherein in the step of creating the profiles with a first database tool, the first database tool comprises a security and authorization profile change request database, wherein the security and authorization profile change request database allows the authorization users and requestors an ability to view documented progress of queries of the profiles (See column 11, lines 36-42, where "authorization users and requestors" is read on "configuration user ";column 29, lines 63-64; column 30, lines 17-25); wherein the first database tool comprises a security and authorization profile change request database, and wherein the security and authorization profile change request database allows the authorization users and requestors an ability to view documented progress of queries of the profiles (See column 11, lines 36-42, where "authorization users and requestors" is read on "configuration user ";column 29, lines 63-64; column 30, lines 17-25); wherein the first database tool comprises a security and authorization profile change request database, and wherein the security and authorization profile change request database allows the authorization users and requestors an ability to view documented progress of queries of the profiles (See column 11, lines 36-42, where "authorization users and requestors" is read on "configuration user ";column 29, lines 63-64; column 30, lines 17-25).

As to claim 8, Sziklai et al., teaches a computer system executing a method for tracking custom computer application development profiles in a data

Art Unit: 2164

processing system (See abstract, where “custom computer application” is read on “information on operations and requirements concerning an activity or area of business”; also see column 8, lines 60-65), the system comprising:

- a first database tool (See abstract; column 32, lines 12-21; column 34, lines 5-8);

- a second database tool connected to the first database tool (See abstract; column 32, lines 24-31; column 34, lines 5-8);

- a third database tool connected to the first and second database tool (See abstract; column 32, lines 32-41; column 34, lines 5-8);

- a data bank connected to the first, second and third database tool (See abstract; column 34, lines 5-8); and

- a security and authorization interface connected to the data processing system (See column 9, lines 13-19; column 14, lines 50-58; column 21, lines 65-67), wherein the first database tool comprises a first set of protocols which create the profiles (See column 8, lines 25-41, lines 60-67; column 9, lines 1-3, where “profiles” is read on “business operations”; also see column 9, lines 13-19),

- wherein the second database tool comprises a second set of protocols which gather requirements of the profiles (See abstract; column 10, lines 24-33, where “disposal of hazardous waste in landfills” is used as an example of collecting profile data and regulations);

- wherein the third database tool comprises a third set of protocols which track modifications of the profiles (See column 8, lines 65-67; column 9, lines 1-3; column 32, lines 24-34); and



Art Unit: 2164

wherein the third database tool is adapted to determine whether breaches in security of the data processing system has occurred in each phase of development of a computer application program (See abstract; column 9, lines 10-16; column 14, lines 50-62; column 21, lines 65-67; column 33, lines 5-10; column 34, lines 1-4).

As to claim 15, Sziklai et al., teaches a program storage device readable by machine, tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by the machine to perform a method for tracking custom computer application development profiles in a data processing system (See abstract, where "custom computer application" is read on "information on operations and requirements concerning an activity or area of business"; also see column 8, lines 60-65), the method comprising:

creating the profiles with a first database tool (See column 8, lines 25-41, lines 60-67; column 9, lines 1-3, where "profiles" is read on "business operations"; also see column 9, lines 13-19);

gathering requirements of the profiles with a second database tool (See abstract; column 10, lines 24-33, where "disposal of hazardous waste in landfills" is used as an example of collecting profile data and regulations);

tracking modifications of the profiles with a third database tool (See column 8, lines 65-67; column 9, lines 1-3; column 32, lines 24-34);

allowing security and authorization users access to the profiles (See column 9, lines 13-19; column 14, lines 50-58; column 21, lines 65-67); and

Art Unit: 2164

determining whether breaches in security of the data processing system has occurred in each phase of development of a computer application program (See abstract; column 9, lines 10-16; column 14, lines 50-62; column 21, lines 65-67; column 33, lines 5-10; column 34, lines 1-4).

### ***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments filed on July 28, 2004, with respect to the rejected claims 1-21 have been fully considered but they are not found to be persuasive:

In response to applicants' arguments regarding claims "1, 8, and 15, contain features, which are patentably distinguishable from the prior art references of record, and in particular Sziklai et al. Specifically, claims 1 and 15 provide, "...wherein determining whether breaches in security of said data processing system has occurred in each phase of development of a computer application program". Sziklai et al., teaches "unauthorized tampering" which can also be considered a "security breach", because when a "security breach" occurs it means an unauthorized person or event has occurred (See column 14, lines 50-58). Although, Sziklai et al., does not go into full detail of "determining security breaches" Sziklai et al., does however, disclose "security concerns" and "other relevant security activities" which can include "determining security breaches". Furthermore, Sziklai et al., discloses "system privileges" and "setting up user groups", which could be created to detect a "security breach" if an unauthorized "user group" tries to access the database. Therefore, independent claims 1, 8 and 15 stand rejected and dependent claims 2-7, 9-14 and 16-21 are

Art Unit: 2164

also rejected because they are dependent on reject independent claims 1, 8 and 15.

### ***Conclusion***

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mellissa M. Chojnacki whose telephone number is (571) 272-4076. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached on (571) 272-4083. The fax

Art Unit: 2164

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mmc  
January 3, 2005

  
**SAM RIMELL**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**